CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOCUS GROUP FORUM
February 15, 2002

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE DISCUSSION POINTS

CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
CONSULTATION	• The required involvement with other stakeholders is a definite strength (useful with other entities within the local government structure)	• Some did not see the benefits of consultation with other governments (government to government) as valuable	None
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION	• Considered adequate		None
HOUSING & HOMELESS NEEDS	No Comment	• HUD does not provide data for the ConPlan like it did for the CHAS – Data no longer available from HUD regarding Federal housing resources. Need more assistance from HUD to acquire this useful data • Homeless data reported in both the CoC Plan and ConPlan	• Consolidate Continuum of Care homeless planning with the ConPlan Planning process – only require a reference to the CoC in the ConPlan • Find another acceptable source of current data • Need flexibility to use locally generated strategic data rather than HUD issued data
HOUSING MARKET ANALYSIS		• Very few use the Housing Market Analysis to determine how funds would be allocated, and the way it is presented in the ConPlan is not seen as useful	• Would like for HUD to provide data on other HUD programs, i.e. Housing Development, Public Housing, etc. in a usable format
STRATEGIC PLAN	• No comment – Group had no issues with the current requirements		• States should have less and/or different requirements than Local Governments – because of the funds distribution process it is difficult to make specific quantifiable projections

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
NON-HOUSING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS		• Table difficult to use and vague on needs	• HUD should provide more details as to why the information is needed, how it is used • Eliminate the table and give local governments more flexibility to provide the data, or allow local governments to certify that this is taken care of in a local planning process
COLLABORATION WITH PHAs	• Some find it valuable, particularly since the PHAs are now required to prepare a plan	• Does not work for the State due to number of PHAs involved • Does not work where PHA goals and the local governments goals are in conflict • Not useful as currently required in the plan	• Combine the PHA and local government planning process
ACTION PLAN	• Ability to amend Plan	• None	• None
WHAT ACTION WOULD YOU PROPOSE TO STREAMLINE THE PROCESS—TO MAKE IT MORE USEFUL AND RESULTS-ORIENTED?	• Keep the flexibility on preparing a 3 or 5 year plan • Coordinating with other jurisdictions • Coordinating with Stakeholders	• Census data becomes obsolete • Mapping not meaningful with the State's plan • Not enough flexibility and too much repetition on the planning component • Difference in the planning schedule for the Action Plan and CoC • ConPlan true spirit is lost in the application process (citizens interested in money) • Not enough time to prepare the	• Drop the 5 Year Plan – Replace with a 2 Year Plan • Need flexibility to add and utilize more local data • Drop Priority Needs Tables or provide more flexibility in construction of tables and data to be provided, to prevent redundancy • HUD should review the communities Comprehensive Plan to determine if it is comprehensive and strategic in

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
		ConPlan due to other local deadlines • Too much disconnect in the planning process	nature, and if it meets HUD's needs, accept it in lieu of the ConPlan. Communities where the State does not require a Comprehensive Plan should still be required to prepare a ConPlan. (Make sure that the focus on the quality of life for low-mod individuals is not lost in the process.) • Develop a centralized Statewide GIS that each community can provide data to keep current. • Consolidate other HUD program planning with the ConPlan planning process, i.e., CoC

IDIS AND ACCOMPLISHMENT REPORTING & CAPER

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
CAPER REPORTING	• Executive Summary and self-assessment. • Doing an Annual Report is good • National data is captured	• No clear checklist on what is needed in the CAPER • When communities work on a reimbursement basis, there is no way to close out activities before the deadline • Weakness in the reporting of accomplishments in IDIS for certain types of activities • Not enough categories in Activity Status—there is a large gap between underway and actual expenditures and accomplishments. There should be a way to report on activities underway – such as percentages • Old GPR forms presented accomplishments more clearly than IDIS reports • No report for CAPER in IDIS to printout household characteristics • The February 18, 1998 instructions on CAPER reporting require a duplication of information • 90-day CAPER submission deadline is not long enough • CAPER written for HUD's use, and is not conducive as an	• Provide a clear checklist of what is needed in the CAPER • Need more categories of status reports—possibly showing percentage of completion • Improve reporting of accomplishments for multi-year funded projects/activities • Make the States CAPER and other reporting consolidated for all programs. Eliminate duplication • Need more time to prepare CAPER – At least 30 more days in order to give additional time for citizens comments • More time to market the CAPER and what good the grantee has done for the community • Too many separate systems – simplify and consolidate • CAPER needs to be written in plain laymen's terms • Tie CAPER back to ConPlan and allow for cumulative reporting

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
		information tool for citizens • IDIS – Problem with reporting on activities with multi-year funding	
MEASURABLE NUMERIC GOALS	• Flexibility to be able to amend Plan	• None	• None
OUTPUT MEASURES	• HUD attempt with IDIS to capture data for National use and reporting to Congress in a meaningful way • The drawdown of funds is working adequately	• Different data required for each formula programs • IDIS not a useful tool for CAPER reporting • IDIS is not integrated with local financial systems – causes difficulty in reconciling • IDIS reports are not useful to grantees or citizens • IDIS reports are cumbersome • Insufficient HUD staff assigned to IDIS to make correction in the System in a timely fashion • IDIS too unreliable for grantee comfort level to use for local reporting purposes • IDIS has problems in capturing and reporting Program Income • Many other reports needed for CAPER reporting not included in IDIS • IDIS does not capture outcomes	• Look at report process for the Empowerment/EC to use as a possible model to capture Output and Outcome Measures • Need to develop the ability to share with Congress more than numbers, i.e., graphic, narrative, etc. • Grantees should provide copies of their CAPERs with supporting documentation directly to their Congressmen • Streamline by making the data collection requirement more uniform across the four formula grants • Do away with IDIS as a part of the CAPER reporting process – HUD should let the grantee know what numbers they need, but allow the grantee the flexibility on how to provide the data • Devise a system other than IDIS to capture data to be used on a National basis that also allows grantees the ability to

CATEGORIES/AREAS OF DISCUSSION	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	RECOMMENDATIONS
			utilize and manipulate the data for their own uses. • Need to move away from the mainframe system and become Windows-based. • Include other reports needed for CAPER reporting in IDIS, i.e., Section 3, Davis Bacon, etc. • GPR forms were clearer and more understandable – Prefer the ENTERS system to IDIS
OUTCOME MEASURES			• Need definite guidance from HUD on what is expected on reporting Outcome. • Reporting should include progress on achievement of long-term goals • Need stronger linkage between neighborhood planning process and the ConPlan planning process • Should not have to provide written narrative addressing anti-poverty when everything they do is geared toward anti-poverty